

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 17, 2007 considered claims 23-36. Claims 23-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Rempell (US 2004/0148307) hereinafter *Rempell* in view of Teague, "DHTML and CSS for the world wide web," hereinafter *Teague*.¹

As a preliminary matter, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic communications of May 16 and May 21. This amendment includes the substance of those communications.

By this paper, claims 23 and 36 have been amended. Claims 23-36 remain pending, of which claims 23, 35, and 36 are the only independent claims.

The claims are generally directed to decorative panels which are displayed by using cells of software tables. The tables have attributes for the individual cells specified such that cells of software tables appear as a cohesive unit forming at least a portion of the decorative panels. To prevent a designer from having to manually update each individual cell when changing the appearance of a decorative panel, methods of and systems for automatically updating attributes in individual cells to change the appearance of a decorative panel are claimed. For example, claim 1 recites displaying a decorative panel by displaying elements in a software table, the software table including a number of cells, according to attributes specified for visually related regions of the decorative panel such that elements displayed in cells of the software table are displayed as a cohesive unit forming at least a portion of the decorative panel. User input is received specifying a change in the appearance of the visual properties of the decorative panel. Changes in the appearance of the visual properties of the decorative panel are mapped to cells in the software table. Attributes of the cells are automatically revised, without a user needing to manipulate individual cells, to correspond to the changes in the appearance of the visual properties of the decorative panel.

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

The art cited in the present Office Action appears to be generally directed to formatting web pages, but does not appear to disclose the software table based method of displaying and revising decorative panels claimed by the claims as now presented. In fact, the references cited do not appear to address tables other than in a very general context.

Rempell, for example is directed to a system for building a web page. See *Rempell* at Abstract. A user interacts with a build frame and a panel, where the user interaction results in a single run time file and an associated database that describe, and when executed, produce a web page. *Id.* *Rempell* only discusses tables insofar as they are able to be included in a web page, but does not include any disclosure indicating that a decorative panel is displayed at a display by displaying elements in a software table or that attributes of the cells are automatically revised, without a user needing to manipulate individual cells, to correspond to changes in the appearance of the visual properties of the decorative panel. Rather, *Rempell* illustrates for example at [0267] that panel JavaScript code is used in validation when a user creates a table. However, *Rempell* does not teach what is recited by the claims of the present application.


Teague does not compensate for the deficiencies of *Rempell*. In fact, *Teague* does not appear to have any treatment whatsoever of software tables. Rather, *Teague* is directed to an explanation of how to implement dynamic HTML which can be implemented so that web pages can react to a user without continued interaction with a server to retrieve data. See *Teague* at 168.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 8th day of June, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
J. LAVAR OLDHAM
Registration No. 53,409
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:JLO:crb
CRB000005287V001